

**REMARKS**

This amendment is in response to the Final Rejection of the pending claims in the Office Action of March 15, 2006 and accompanies a Request for Continued Examination.

Claims 1 through 17 and 20 through 23 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 1, 11, 13 through 15, and 20 have been amended herein.

Claims 18 and 19 have been canceled herein. No new matter has been entered to the disclosure as the amendment clearly complies with 35 U.S.C. § 132. The amendments and cancellations are made without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification and particularly in paragraphs [0011], [0025], [0027], [0028], and [0036]. The amendments are to clearly distinguish the invention over the cited art.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Anticipation Rejections**

**Anticipation Rejection Based on Docter *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,330,610)**

Claims 1 through 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Docter *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,330,610) (hereinafter "Dokter"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant asserts that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Regarding presently amended independent claim 1, Applicant asserts that Dokter does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of presently amended independent claim 1 in as complete detail as contained in the claim to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant asserts that Dokter does not describe "each at least one prespecified characteristic independently selected from a group consisting of . . . a file type, a file string, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, a password, time of transmission, cumulative number of files sent by a user, cumulative number of files sent by a user over a given time, file string, and time-consuming print

commands.” Applicant asserts that Docter describes that the filter system may be used with text, graphics, product updates (such as software updates), or executable instructions. *Col. 3, lines 37-41*. However, Applicant asserts that Docter does not describe that those categories may be used as the filter criteria. Rather, Applicant asserts that Docter describes using profile data as the filter criteria, such as, user-specific information (*e.g.*, age, occupation, or marital status), user roles (*e.g.*, professor or V.P. of Engineering), and user class (*e.g.*, marketing or engineers). *Col. 6, lines 5-27*. Therefore, Docter does not describe the prespecified characteristics of presently amended independent claim 1. For at least this reason, Docter does not anticipate presently amended independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2 through 10 are allowable for at least the reason of depending either directly or indirectly from allowable presently amended independent claim 1.

Claim 2 is additionally allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a filtering program stored by at least one of a memory device and firmware of a printer associated with a processor.

Claim 6 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a filtering program that causes a processor to prevent a printing component from printing a file of a packet having at least one undesirable characteristic.

Claim 7 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a filtering program that instructs a processor to cause a printing component to print a file of a packet having a desirable characteristic.

Claim 8 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a filtering program that instructs a processor to cause a printing component to print a file only if a packet lacks an undesirable characteristic and has a desirable characteristic.

Claim 9 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently an undesirable characteristic comprising one of a file type, a file string, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, and at least one prespecified command.

Claim 10 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a desirable characteristic comprising one of a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file type, and a password.

Regarding presently amended independent claim 11, Applicant asserts that Docter does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of presently amended independent claim 11 in as complete detail as contained in the claim to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant asserts that Docter does not describe “evaluating at least one prespecified characteristic of said printing packet by a processor of said printer.” Docter describes that “[t]he second stage of filtering may be performed by a client or a more trusted server.” *Col. 3, lines 10-11*. Docter describes that a printer may be coupled to this client or server. *Col. 10, lines 7-9*. However, Docter does not describe that the printer does any of the filtering; rather, any filtering occurs prior to the printer of Docter receiving any data. Therefore, Docter does not describe “evaluating at least one prespecified characteristic of said printing packet by a processor of said printer.”

Additionally, Applicant asserts that Docter does not describe “each at least one prespecified characteristic independently selected from a group consisting of . . . a file type, a file string, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, a password, time of transmission, cumulative number of files sent by a user, cumulative number of files sent by a user over a given time, file string, and time-consuming print commands.” Applicant asserts that Docter describes that the filter system may be used with text, graphics, product updates (such as software updates), or executable instructions. *Col. 3, lines 37-41*. However, Applicant asserts that Docter does not describe that those categories may be used as the filter criteria. Rather, Applicant asserts that Docter describes using profile data as the filter criteria, such as, user-specific information (*e.g.*, age, occupation, or marital status), user roles (*e.g.*, professor or V.P. of Engineering), and user class (*e.g.*, marketing or engineers). *Col. 6, lines 5-27*. Therefore, Docter does not describe the prespecified characteristics of presently amended independent claim 11.

For at least the above reasons, Docter does not anticipate presently amended independent claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 11 is allowable.

Claims 12 through 17 are allowable for at least the reason of depending either directly or indirectly from allowable presently amended independent claim 11.

Claims 18 and 19 have been canceled herein.

Claim 13 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently preventing processing of an at least one file of the printing packet by the printer if the printing packet has an undesirable characteristic.

Claim 14 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently permitting processing of an at least one file of the printing packet by the printer if the printing packet has a desirable characteristic.

Claim 15 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently permitting processing of an at least one file of the printing packet by the printer if the printing packet lacks at least one undesirable characteristic and has at least one desirable characteristic.

Claim 16 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently an undesirable characteristic comprising one of a file type, a file string, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, and at least one prespecified command.

Claim 17 is further allowable since Docter does not describe expressly or inherently a desirable characteristic comprising one of a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file type, and a password.

Regarding presently amended independent claim 20, Applicant asserts that Docter does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of presently amended independent claim 20 in as complete detail as contained in the claim to anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant asserts that Docter does not describe "a packet including at least one file to be printed . . . the packet, prior to filtering, further including instructions for a printer, the instructions comprising . . . information about a source of media onto which printing of said at least one file is to be effected, information about orientation in which said at least one file is to be printed on a media, information about whether printing is to be effected on one or two sides of a media, information about a number

of copies to be printed, or information about whether multiple copies should be collated.” Applicant asserts that the data of Docter, prior to filtering, does not include “instructions for a printer.”

Additionally, Applicant asserts that Docter does not describe “allowing printing of said at least one file to be printed by the destination device based on at least one of a presence or absence of at least one prespecified characteristic from said packet including said at least one file to be printed.” Applicant asserts that Docter is related to “a system for filtering data in multiple stages without exposing private information to untrusted servers.” *Col. 1, line 66 to Col. 2, line 1*. Applicant asserts that Docter addresses the problem that “[s]ince the server is unable to filter data based on private criteria not provided to the server by the user, the user may receive a significant amount of irrelevant data. This irrelevant data is time consuming to review and creates a distraction from the user’s normal work or activities.” *Col. 1, lines 42-46*. Applicant asserts that Docter does not describe “allowing printing” based on the results of the filtering.

Furthermore, Applicant asserts that Docter does not describe “each at least one prespecified characteristic independently selected from a group consisting of . . . a file type, a file string, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, a password, time of transmission, cumulative number of files sent by a user, cumulative number of files sent by a user over a given time, file string, and time-consuming print commands.” Applicant asserts that Docter describes that the filter system may be used with text, graphics, product updates (such as software updates), or executable instructions. *Col. 3, lines 37-41*. However, Applicant asserts that Docter does not describe that those categories may be used as the filter criteria. Rather, Applicant asserts that Docter describes using profile data as the filter criteria, such as, user-specific information (*e.g.*, age, occupation, or marital status), user roles (*e.g.*, professor or V.P. of Engineering), and user class (*e.g.*, marketing or engineers). *Col. 6, lines 5-27*. Therefore, Docter does not describe the prespecified characteristics of presently amended independent claim 20.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, Docter does not anticipate presently amended independent claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, presently amended independent claim 20 is allowable.

Claims 21 through 23 are allowable for at least the reason of depending either directly or indirectly from allowable presently amended independent claim 20.

Applicant asserts that claims 1 through 17 and 20 through 23 are clearly allowable over the cited art.

Applicant requests the allowance of claims 1 through 17 and 20 through 23 and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan  
Registration No. 28,393  
Attorney for Applicant  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: July 20, 2006

JRD/dlm:lmh

Document in ProLaw